



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

HD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,917	07/03/2001	Siu-Leong Iu	067339-0033	3640
20277	7590	06/22/2007	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				WINTER, JOHN M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3621		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
		06/22/2007		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/763,917	IU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John M. Winter	3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Acknowledgements*

The Applicants amendment filed on April 9, 2007 is acknowledged, Claims 19-30 remain pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

The Applicant's arguments filed on April 9, 2007 have been fully considered. The The amended claims are rejected in view of 35 USC 112

See following rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 19, 20, 21, 23-30 disclose "a playback unit", however the claim language states "image produced by multiple playback units", it is unclear how one playback unit can be enabled to be multiple playback units..

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19,20,21,23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads, (US Patent No 6,363,159) in view of Saito (US Patent 6,182,218) and further in view of Chaum (US Patent 5,959,717).

As per claim 19,

Rhoads ('159) discloses a playback unit, comprising:

an input for receiving an encoded data stream bearing a video image;

(Figures 2 and 3)

Rhoads ('159) does not explicitly disclose "a decoder for decoding the encoded data stream;". Saito ('218) discloses "a decoder for decoding the encoded data stream;,"(Figure 1, column 8, lines 15-18). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Rhoads ('159)'s method with Saito's teaching in order to enforce digital rights management systems.

Rhoads ('159) does not explicitly disclose " means for imparting a prescribed transformation to the video image for warping the video image in a manner, and by an amount, not readily visible to a viewer such that a composite video image produced by multiple video playback units will be distorted and the distortion of the composite video image can be seen by the viewer, wherein said warping changes with time during playback of the video image ".

Chaum ('717) discloses "means for imparting a prescribed transformation to the video image for

warping the video image in a manner, and by an amount, not readily visible to a viewer such that a composite video image produced by multiple video playback units will be distorted and the distortion of the composite video image can be seen by the viewer, wherein said warping changes with time during playback of the video image "(Column 8, lines 57-67 – column 9 lines 1-9). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Rhoads ('159)'s method with Chaum ('717) teaching in order to enforce digital rights management systems.

Claims 20,21 and 23-30 are in parallel with claim 19 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 22 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the rejection under 35 USC 112..

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JMW



ANDREW J. FISCHER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600